A JUSTIFICATION

Of two Points now in Controverſie with the

ANABAPTISTS

Concerning

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Baptiſme:

The firſt is, That Infants of Chriſtians ought to be Baptized, with grounds to prove it, and their Objections anſwered.

With a briefe Anſwer to Maſter TOMBES twelve doubtfull Argumen.s againſt it in his Exercitation about Infants Baptiſme.

Alſo a briefe Anſwer to Captaine HOBSONS five Arguments in his ſalacy of Infants Baptiſme, being (as he ſaith) that which ſhould have beene diſputed by him, and Mr. *Knowles*, and ſome others, againſt Mr. *Calamy* and Mr. *Cranford*.

The ſecond Point is, That the Sprinckling the Baptized more agreeth with the minde of Chriſt then Dipping or Plunging in or under the Water: With grounds to prove it, and a briefe Anſwer to what they have to ſay againſt it.

By *T. B.*

Joh. 3. 1. *Beloved, beleeve not every ſpirit, but try the ſpirits whither they are of God, becauſe many falſe prophets are gone out into the world.*

Imprimatur John Downham.

London printed for *Henry Sheperd* at the Bible in Tower-ſtreet, and for *William Ley* at his ſhop in *Pauls* Church-yard neere Doctors Commons. 1646.

Ex. d. Edw. Richardson.

To the Reader.

CHriſtian Reader, conſidering it ever was, and ſtill is the cuſtome of all Chriſtian Churches in the world to baptize their Infants, and to ſprinkle the Baptized; although it hath been long oppoſed by the Anabaptiſts, yet they never left it in any age; then although thoſe men have publiſhed many Books of late againſt it, and no Anſwer to them is yet come forth, which makes them ready to ſay with the King of *Aſſyria*, *I have gathered all the earth, and there was none that moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped forth againſt it*, *Iſaiah* 10. 14. Yet let not this little book be deſpiſed for the unworthineſſe of the Author, but read it till ſome more able hand ſhall move for thy better ſatisfaction; thou knoweſt not but God may ſometimes hide things from the wiſe & prudent, and reveale them to babes, becauſe it ſo pleaſeth him, *Luke* 10. 21. *Aquilla* and his Wife tooke *Apollo* that was mighty in Scriptures, and ſhewed him the way of God more perfectly, *Acts* 18. *Naaman* hearkned to his Maid-ſervant, when ſhe told him of a Prophet in Iſrael that would cure him of his Leproſie; and to the advice of another ſervant, to obſerve the Prophets directions, 2 *King*. 5. Then look not on the Author, but weigh the matter and arguments in the balance of the Sanctuary, and if they hold weight give God the praiſe, and me thy prayers; and I ſhall remaine thine in all Chriſtian duties to be commanded

Thomas Bakewell.

265.1
B179L

The first Point in Controversie with the *Anabaptists* is, That Infants of Christians ought to be Baptized: the grounds to prove it are these following.

FIrst, if Christ commanded, and his Apostles practised the Baptisme of Infants, then it ought to be done; but Christ commanded to Baptize all Nations, whereof Infants are a part, Mat. 28. 19. and the Apostles Baptized whole Housholds, whereof Infants are a part, Acts 16. 15. 33. 1 Cor. 1. 16. therefore Infants of Christians ought to be baptized.

Secondly, if Christian Infants have the promise to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, then they ought to have the outward forme of Baptisme; but the Holy Ghost is promised to Christians and their children, Acts 2. 38, 39. therefore their children ought to be baptized.

Thirdly, If Infants of Christians be separated from Turkes and Infidels by vertue of their Parents Baptisme, then they ought to be Baptized; but Infants of Christians have this marke of distinction, For now saith *Paul*, Your children are holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. that is, they have an outward sanctification, being distinguished from Infidels, for the visible Church therefore they ought to be Baptized.

Fourthly, If Christ did admit Infants to come unto him, and blamed them that would keepe them backe, and giving this testimony of them, that those little children which he had in his Armes did beleeve on him, and that they had a right to the Kingdome of Heaven, then they ought to be Baptized; But the first is true, Mat. 18. 3. 6. 19. 13. 14. Mark 9. 36. 10. 14. 10. Luke 18. 15. 16. therefore Infants of Christians ought to be Baptized.

Fifthly, If infants of Jewes were circumcised, and Christ came not to take away that benefit from them, but to change it to a better and larger benefit, from Males alone to Males and Females, and from one Nation to all Nations, and from a painefull duty to an easie duty, then I say that Christian infants ought to be Baptized as well as the Jewish infants were circumcised; but Christ never repealed that Command, but did enlarge it to all Nations, Mat. 28. 19. and to both men and women, Acts 8. 12. 16. 15. therefore Christian infants ought to be baptized.

Sixthly, if the Apostles businesse was onely to convert men of yeares from false religion to the Christian Religion, before they did admit them

954099

to Baptiſme, and did not wait till they were converted, from the ſtate of corrupted nature to the ſtate of Grace, becauſe they knew no mans heart, having the firſt converſion they baptized many without the ſecond; then Chriſtian infants who have no falſe religion to be converted from, ought to be baptized, although they be not converted from the ſtate of corruption to the ſtate of Grace; but the Apoſtles onely required men to beleeve that Chriſt was the Sonne of God, the Eunuch beleeved this and was baptized, and *Simon Magus* beleeved this and was baptized, although ſtill in the gall of bitterneſſe, and in the bonds of iniquity, Acts 8. 12. 23. 37. and many beleeved the Scripture, and the words of Jeſus, many beleeved in his name, yet Chriſt would not truſt them although they were his Diſciples, for he knew their hearts, and needed not that any ſhould teſtifie of them, yet thoſe went away from Chriſt and never returned to him, Joh. 2. 23, 24. 6. 66. this ſhewes they had onely the firſt converſion, and not the ſecond; and Jewiſh infants were circumciſed, if the Parents was but of their Religion, never waiting for the childes converſion from corrupted nature to the ſtate of Grace, and Chriſtians have as much power to bring up their children in the Chriſtian Religion, as they had to bring them up in the Jewiſh Religion; then it is a cleare truth that Chriſtian infants ought to be baptized.

Their Objections are next to be anſwered.

FIrſt they Object; If they muſt firſt be taught before they be Baptized, then infants may not be baptized; but the firſt is true, Mat. 28. 19. *ergo*, ſo is the ſecond. *I anſ.* The teaching them to obſerve, and to doe all that is commanded in that place, followes both Preaching and Baptiſme that both may be obſerved; elſe it were to affirme that Chriſt would have one Ordinance to be obſerved and not the other, when as he ſaith, *Obſerve and doe whatſoever I have commanded you*; ver. 19 20. And to ſay Teaching is firſt ſet downe is not much to the purpoſe; if it be, then *John* did Baptize in the Wilderneſſe, and then it is ſaid, he Preached the Baptiſme of Repentance, Mark 1. 4. and Chriſt ſaith, A *man muſt be borne of water, and then of the Spirit*, John 3. 5. and *John* the *Baptiſt* ſaid, *I baptize you with water, but he comes after that baptizeth with the holy Ghoſt*, Mat. 3. 11. but Maſter *Tombes* ſaith, To baptize Infants is to baptize thoſe whom the Lord hath not apointed to be baptized; and yet he grants, that infants may be baptized with the holy Ghoſt, and might be baptized if they were knowne to us from that Text, Acts 10. 47. But ſaith he, To baptize infants becauſe Chriſt commands to Baptize all Nations is very faulty; Firſt in caſting away that reſtriction which Chriſt hath put. Secondly, in determining that all men whatſoever are to be baptized, and ſo it is no priviledge to beleevers and their children, but as common to Infidels as to their children. *I anſwer.* Here he denies the command of Chriſt to be a Rule,

and

and would make a restriction where Christ makes none, and then he makes a false conclusion, as if he ever said, or did intend to baptize the children of Infidels before their Parents be taught the Covenant, and so by baptisme were admitted into the Christian Church, but yet in other places he saith himselfe, that beleevers children have no priviledge above the children of Infidels, but because he slights this generall command to all Nations, which includes all sorts of Mankinde, because he hath not a speciall command for Infants onely, I may say to him as Christ said to the Pharisees, when they said, to sweare by the Temple was nothing, but he that swore by the gold of it was a debtor; so the command to Baptize all Nations is nothing, unlesse it were for infants onely, when as the Temple sanctifies the gold, Mat. 23. 16. 17. and the whole Nation includes infants, but he must have them Disciples first, because it was reported that Christ made and baptized Disciples, John 4. 2. when as he grants it to be a false report, therefore nothing can safely be drawne from it, but I shall give a further answer to this, and Captaine *Hobsons* third agreement together. Againe, suppose we grant that men of yeares, who are converted from false religions to the true Christian Religion, that such must be taught the Covenant, being capable of Teaching before they have the token of it given to them; thus it was with *Abraham*, and with many Heathens when they were converted to the Jewes religion; but when they were admitted their infants had a right to it without any teaching going before; and when they were capable they taught them the Covenant as they were commanded, Deut. 4. 10. 13. and so they taught them the meaning of the Passeover, Exod. 12. 26. 27. then why may not Christian infants be taught the Covenant after they have received the token of it as well as Jewish infants. Againe, as they were meere passives when they received the token of the Covenant, so are our infants, the worke is done upon them therefore they may be baptized.

Secondly, they Object, That if they must repent before they be baptized, then infants may not be baptized; but the first is true, Acts 2. 38. *ergo*, so is the second. *Answ.* It is true in men of yeares that are converted from Heathens to the Christian Religion, but it is neither required of Jewish infants before Circumcision, nor of Christian infants before Baptisme; for as they Circumcised their infants, so *John* baptized them before or unto repentance, Mat. 3. 11. therefore Christian infants ought to be baptized; but what if the Saduces and Pharisees, and the bloody Murtherers of Christ be called upon to repent before either *John*, or *Peter* will admit them to baptisme, will it follow that infants of Christians must doe so actually before they be admitted to Baptisme? the one of these was a generation of Vipers, having the leaven of false doctrine that must be purged out, Mat. 16. 12. else like Vipers it would eate out the heart and life of

Christian Religion, Mat. 3. 7. and the other was the leaven of prophanenesse, which like Savage Beasts would trample Religion under their feet, then this also must be purged out, 1 Cor. 5. 7. 13. then as both must be purged out, so they must be both kept out. But will it follow, that infants must repent of Murthers and Heresies before they be admitted to Baptisme, let them that would have them to repent of those foule sinnes prove them guilty of them, or else they are very unjust to debarre them of the Priviledges of the Church, and actually Excommunicate them without any tryall or just proofe against them, and till then we must hold that they ought to be baptized.

Thirdly they Object, If none must be Baptized but such as are called, then Infants of Christians may not be Baptized. But the first is true, Act. 1. 39. *ergo*, so is the second. *I Answ.* It is true, to those afarre off, they must be called to the Christian Religion, but it is not true to Christians already called, nor required of their Infants any more then it was of Jewish Infants, for by vertue of their call their Children are holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. and ought to be baptized.

Fourthly, they Object, That if none must be baptized but those that confesse their sinnes, then Infants must not be baptized. But the first is true, Mat. 3. 6. *ergo* so is the second. *I answ.* This also is true in men of yeares, who are converted from Heathenisme to the Christian Religion; so it was when any were converted to the Jewish Religion, but what is this to Infants, either Jewes, or Christians. Againe, when multitudes came to *John* to be baptized of him, some few of them might confesse the sinnes of all, as being the mouth of the people to God, as any Minister is in his Congregation, then this hinders not, but theirs and our Infants may be baptized.

Fifthly, they Object, If none must be baptized but such as beleeve, then Infants may not be baptized. But the first is true, Mark 16. 16. Acts 8. 36, 37. *ergo*, so is the second. *I Answ.* If none but such as we know doe truely beleeve must be baptized, then we must baptize none at all, because we know no mans heart, and Faith is that new name written which none knowes but he that receives it, Revel. 2. 17. Againe, if none must be baptised but true beleevers, and we cannot know them, we may soone mistake, and set the token of the Covenant upon Reprobates, and refuse to give it to the Elect. Againe, Christ said, Those little ones that he tooke in his Armes did beleeve in him, see Mat. 16. 6. compared with Luke 9. 26, and their hearts may as well be knowne to us as the hearts of men of yeares, for we know the hearts of none. Again, that faith that was required was but to beleeve that Christ was the Son of God, and that the Christian Religion was the true Religion; but Infants of Christians have taken up no false Religion, then it need not be required that they should beleeve the true, being brought up in none other. Againe, to baptize none but

those

those that doe truly beleeve were the direct way to cast out the token of the *Covenant* altogether, because we cannot truly know them, then wee ought not to neglect this duty to baptize Infants.

Sixthly, They say, if none ought to be baptized but such as make profession of justifying faith, then Infants ought not to be baptized; but Infants cannot make such profession. And saith Master *Tombes*, Neither *John* the *Baptist*, nor the Apostles would baptize any without some shewes of faith and repentance. And although he grants, that Infants may have a right to Heaven, yet they must not be baptized till that appeare. But I say, their hearts will never be knowne to us, then they had as good say they shall never be baptized, as to say, they shall not be baptized till they know their hearts. Againe, would not the Apostles baptize any unlesse they professe a lye, & that in the presence of Christ who knew their hearts, and then might they lawfully be baptized when they had professed a lye in the presence of Christ, for they baptized alwaies in his presence before his death, *John.* 3. 22. 26. 42. that they might be his Disciples and not theirs. And would Christ have all those to professe that they had true justifying faith? when as he knew their hearts and would not trust them, *John.* 2. *v.* 23, 24. What horrible blasphemy is this? No, they were required but to beleeve that Christ was the Sonne of God, and his Religion was the true Religion, and then they had right to Baptisme in the approbation of *Christ* and his Apostles; and their parents profession might be imputed to the child, because they have power to bring them up in that Religion they professe, as well as the Jewes had power to bring up their Infants in their Religion; neither had their Infants any other profession but that of their parents; then christian Infants may as well be baptized as Jewish Infants were circumcised.

Seventhly, They object against my second ground, saying, The gift of the Holy Ghost there promised, *Act.* 2. 39. is not the sanctifying Gift, but the gift of Tongues, and miracles to cast out Divels, and to cure all manner of diseases, *Mark.* 16. 17. *I answ. John* the *Baptist* was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mothers wombe, *Luk.* 1. 15. to shew that as he was fit for Baptisme from the wombe, so he should judge of others: Neither could that be the gift of tongues, nor the gift of miracles as soon as he was born, but the gift of sanctification which *Jeremiah* had before he was borne, *Jer.* 1. 5. Then if Infants may be so baptized with the Holy Ghost, wee may not deny them the outward forme of Baptisme. But saith Master *Tombes*, That promise is to Jewes that were called of the sending of *Christ*, from these Texts, *Act.* 3. 25. 26. 13. 32. 33. This we grant. But then he saith, Mention is made of a Promise, not as of it selfe, yeelding right to Baptisme without repentance, but as a motive to those that repent and are baptized. But to this we grant, that Baptisme without repentance is of no

value;

value; But when we heare the Baptisme of the Holy Ghost is promised to christian Infants, and they have power to bring them up in the christian Religion, then I would know why such may not be baptized, having no false Religion to repent of, and the promise of the inward Baptisme; thus sure their parents that have power to bring them up in the true Religion, have also power to set the marke of a christian upon them, to be knowne from Turks and Infidels. But then he saith, That Promise was made to Jewish Infants, and therefore not to christian Infants, but this is a meere cavill against the Text, and not worth answering.

Eighthly, They object against my third ground, saying, That the holynesse which children have from their parents, is nothing else but this, those parents have a sanctified use of them, for unto the pure all things are pure, *Tit.*1.15. I answer, If all things be pure unto them, then other mens children, yea Infidels children are pure unto them, yea the stones and Beasts of the Field are at peace with them, *Job.* 5 23. yea they have a sanctified use both of the evill of sinne and the evill of punishment, for all things shall worke together for their good that love God, *Rom.*3.28. but this benefit comes not by marrying of beleevers, but by our marriage with Christ; but this had beene to small purpose for *Paul* to say, That beleevers have a sanctified use of their children, when as he had not onely said before, they have a sanctified use of them, but of all things else; then the meaning is this, they have such a holinesse as the Jewes had, to distinguish them from other Nations, to be of the church of God, a holy Nation; so Infants of christians are distinguished from Turks and Infidels, to be of the visible church, as well as the Jewish Infants by this marke of distinction: now they are holy, therefore they ought to be baptized. But Master *Tombes* saith, That holinesse spoken by *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is nothing else but this, they are legitimate, that is, they are not bastards. To this I answer, That the *Corinthians* were Gentiles or Heathens before *Paul* preached amongst them, and by his preaching some times he converted a wife to the christian Religion, and could not convert the husband, and sometimes the husband and not the wife, but if either of them was converted from their dumbe Idols wherein they were led, 1 *Cor.* 12. 2 to the christian faith, now, saith *Paul*, your children are holy: It seemes when either of them was converted the great question to the Apostle was this, Whether their children had a right to the Ordinance of Baptisme, and so to all other priviledges of the christian church? To this a secret answer is implyed, That they had a right to all the Ordinances and priviledges of the christian church, for now, saith *Paul*, your children are holy, that is, they are distinguished now from Heathens and Infidels children, so that now one of the parents is become a christian, it cannot be said now that they are Infidels children; but when both the parents were converted to

the

the christian Religion, then the matter was out of question, so that then they need not aske whether their children should enjoy the priviledges of the christian church; this being the true genuine meaning of the Text: Now let us see what truth is in Master *Tombes* interpretation of it, saying, Now they are legittimate, now they are not bastards; but can any rationall man think this, that if a mans wife was converted to the christian Religion, that then shee would come to the Apostles to aske them whether or not their children were bastards; could any man living tell that better then shee her selfe; if shee were a whore then they were bastards, but not else. Againe, them that were lawfully married before *Paul* came amongst them, and had children, they were not bastards by Master *Tombes* owne confession; bnt saith *Paul* of those children, that they were uncleane then, but now saith he, they are holy, because one of the Parents is become a christian, now those children are not heathens but christians; so then, if the same children which before were uncleane, and now are holy by the conversion of one of the Parents, it must needs be such a holinesse to distinguish them from Infidels, to be of the true christian Church; then he that denies this truth, must needes draw this conclusion, that the same children which before *Paul* came there were bastards, but now one of the Parents is converted to the christian Religion, those children that were bastards and uncleane, are now holy and no bastards. Againe, shall we be such fools, as to think, because the husband is a Christian, that his christianity will so sanctifie his wife, that shee cannot have a bastard, or will her being a christian so sanctifie her husband that he cannot have a bastard; if this were true, then how comes it to passe that we have so many bastards in *Engl.* when both the husband & the wife professe themselves to be christians, and yet sometimes both of them are so prophane as to have bastards? then I say, that holinesse spoken of by *Paul* is that mark of distinction to be knowne from Turks and Infidels to be of the visible Church of Christ, and therefore have a true right to baptisme, and so to all other Ordinances and priviledges of the christian Church, although infancy or sicknesse may hinder them from some of them, yet it cannot from baptisme, being onely passive, the work is done upon them, and no action required of them, therefore they may and ought to be baptized.

Ninthly, they object against my fifth ground, saying, that command of God ceased, which did command to set the token of the Covenant upon Jewish Infants, when Christ came and changed that token of circumcision into baptisme: But I say, the command remaines, although the token be changed; as for instance: God commanded the children

of Israel to keepe holy the seventh day, for it was the Sabbath of the Lord their God; but this command remaines, although by Christ the day was changed; and so for other commands to Israel, thou shalt have no other gods but me; thou shalt not make to thy selfe any graven image, nor bow downe unto it, nor take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine; but although the Church of the Jewes be cut off, and the christian Church grafted in, we may not say these commands were repeald when the Church was changed, and so conclude that Christians may have other gods, and bow downe to them, and worship them, and take the name of Israels God in vaine, because the command was not made to us, but to them; nor keep no Sabbath, because the command was made to them and not to us; nor set the token of the Covenant on our children, because it was to them and not to us, because our Church and Sabbath, and token of the Covenant was all changed; then unlesse you be minded to cast off God, the Sabbath, the Sacraments, the true Religion, let your children be baptized.

Tenthly, they object, saying, those that have a right to one of the Sacraments, have a right to both, but Infants have no right to the Lords Supper, because they cannot examine themselves, nor remember the death of Christ, nor discerne his body in the Sacrament, then Infants may not be baptized. *I answ.* Those impediments that hinder them from receiving the Lords Supper, are no impediments to hinder them from Baptisme, because nothing is required in the baptized Infants; they are meerly passive, the work is done upon them, when as the Lords supper requires many actions, as to take, eat, doe this, in men of age and understanding. Againe, I doubt not but Infants have a right to both Sacraments, and all other Ordinances, although by naturall infirmities they are for the present disabled from some of them, as by sicknesse or infancy; yet this hinders not, nor disables any from Baptisme, therefore Infants ought to be baptized, although baptisme is not of absolute necessity where it cannot be had, yet this contempt of it is damnable, but in times of persecution, or in a journey, it may be deferred, as Israel did in the Wildernesse forty yeers, *Josh.* 5. 5. but they might not doe so in *Canaan*, for if they doe, it may be their children when they come to age would despise that Ordinance, and then they are to be cut off from *Israel*, because they have broken the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 14. and how doe these men know but their children will despise the covenant when they come to age? Nay, I dare say, it is the onely way to make them despise it when they come to age; for it is said, *all the people that heard Christ, and the Publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptisme of* John (that is) *with water*, Mat. 3. 11. *but the Pharises and Lawyers rejected*

the

t be Councell of God, being not baptized of John, Luke 7.29.30. And it were a just judgement of God upon such Parents, that will not set that marke of distinction, to sever their children from Turks by baptisme, that they should never be severed from corrupted nature to the state of grace; then to avoid this, let them be baptized.

Eleventhly, they object, that if Christ, who saith, *learne of me*, was not baptized till he was 30 yeers old, then Infants must not be baptized, *Luke* 3.23. But the first is true, *ergo*, so is the second. *Answ.* It is true that Christ bad us learne of him to be humble and meek, *Mat.* 11.28. but he did not bid us learne of him to be 30 yeers old before that we be baptized, and if we learne that, we must neither be more nor lesse but just of his age. Againe, he was both circumcized and baptized, but he did not bid us learne both. Againe, at thirty yeeres old he put an end to the Jewish Religion, and could not be baptized before; neither could he set up Christian Religion, till he had put downe the Jewish Religion: But I would not have the Anabaptists to tarry till they be thirty yeers old before they become Christians, and say they learned to doe so of Christ. Againe, at the same time, others were baptized at severall ages, some more, some lesse then the age of Christ; then the matter lay in this, whether they were converted from false Religions to the true Religion, although they were uot converted from the state of corrupted nature to the state of grace, they baptized them; we read of none that ever were denied to be baptized but the Pharises and Sadduces who came to *John* to be baptized; but he refused to baptize them, because they would not leave their sects and sciſmes, they would be Pharises and Sadduces still, therefore he cals them *A generation of Vipers*, Mat. 3.7. becauſe such would eat out the bowels of the christian Church; this might be an item to all the sects and sciſmes amongst us, who are no better then Vipers both to Church and State; but when any was admitted to Baptisme, if they did but beleeve that Christ was the Sonne of God, and his was the true Religion; I say, although they should become Papists or prophane drunkards, or swearers, or adulterers, and should be excommunicated for such wickednesse, yet still they having a right to the Ordinances, as a Free-man hath of a Corporation, although for the present he be in prison, and cannot make use of it, till he hath compounded with his adversaries, and this man given satisfaction to the Church; therefore his children ought to be baptized, unlesse the Parents turn Turks, and so renounce Christ and christian Religion; yet if but one of them should doe this, their children are holy, and ought to be baptized, notwithstanding all other failings whatsoever.

Twelfthly, thed object, if none must be baptizey, and so receive the

token of the Covenant but such as have the Covenant, then Infants must not be baptized; but they say the first is true, because they are uncapable to receive the covenant, therefore they ought not to be baptized, which is the token of the covenant. Here I might answer, that christian Infants are as capable both to receive the covenant and the token of it, as the Jewish Infants were; but it is not true to say they onely that have the covenant must have the signes and tokens of it, for the male children of the Jewes all had the token of the covenant, both the elect and reprobates without any difference, and women which were in the covenant of grace as well as men, yet the signe and token of it was set onely on men, though reprobates, rather then on women, though never so faithfull; for the token of the covenant is not given as a personall benefit to all that have it, but it is given for the good of Gods people, who ought to rejoyce and be thankfull for it where-ever they see it; God made a covenant with *Adam*, but the token of it was set on trees; and God made a covenant with *Noah*, but the token of it was set in the clouds; so God might have set the token of the covenant of grace in the clouds or on trees, or onely on wicked men if he had so pleased; then shall we quarrell with God, and say, we will have the token of the covenant set onely on such as have the covenant, as if the rain-bow should be set on all men since *Noahs* flood; no, let us do as faithfull women did in the Church of the Jewes, who could rejoyce and be thankfull for the token of the covenant of grace, although it was not set on them but on men onely, and many of them reprobates; yet we doe not find that ever they murmured against God, because they had not the token of the covenant upon them as well as men; then I conclude, notwithstanding these objections, that christian Infants ought to be baptized.

But Master *Tombes* hath some more places of Scripture to examine, the first is *Gen.* 17. 7. from which we prove that God did establish his everlasting Covenant to *Abraham*; and *verse* 21. he established that everlasting covenant also with *Isaac*; and being established thus to *Abraham* and *Isaac*, then it was also confirmed unto *Jacob*, for an everlasting covenant, *Psal.* 105. 10. But this covenant was made with Christ from all eternity; so *Prov.* 8. 23. 1 *Pet.* 1. 20. *Titus* 1. 2. now circumcision was a token of that everlasting covenant, *Gen.* 17. 10, 11. and not a token that they should enjoy the land of *Canaan*, and so it sutes with baptisme, which is also a token of that everlasting covenant, which God the Father made with God the Son from all eternity; but Master *Tombes* saith, that Covenant to which circumcision had relation, being established to *Abraham*, that he saith was a mixed covenant, and therfore not the same with ours. *I answ.* All temporall promises both to *Abrahams* posterity and also to us, are but the over-flowing of those promises contained in that everlasting covenant, for godlinesse

hath

hath the promiſe of the life that now is, and of that which is to come, 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. ſeek the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt, and all theſe things ſhall be added unto you, *Matth.* 6. 33. ſo then, we have as many promiſes of outward things as the Jewes had; but then to encreaſe his doubting, he ſaith, *Abraham's* ſeed is many wayes to be taken. *I anſw.* The ſeed to whom the covenant was made was but one, and that was Chriſt, *Gal.* 3. 16. and to all the elect when they are grafted into Chriſt by faith, as we enter into the firſt *Adams* covenant when we come to have his image of nature, ſo we come into the ſecond *Adams* covenant when we come to have his image of grace; now circumciſion was the token of this covenant to the Jewes, as baptiſme is to Chriſtians; but I ſhall ſpeak more fully of this, in anſwer to Captaine *Hobſons* firſt argument.

Secondly, Maſter *Tombes* ſaith, to encreaſe his donbtings, that if baptiſm ſucceed circumciſion, then none but males ought to be baptized, becauſe none but males were circumciſed, and *John* Baptiſt did baptize before circumciſion of right ceaſed, therefore it doth not ſucceed circumciſion, although they both ſignifie the righteouſneſſe of faith, *Rom.* 4. 11. 6. 3. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. and the ſame ſanctification of the heart, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. But ſaith he, they differ in ſome things; firſt, circumciſion did ſignifie, that Chriſt ſhould come of *Iſaac*, *Gen.* 17. 21. but baptiſme doth ſignifie his death and reſurrection. *I anſw.* although they are both tokens of the ſame covenant, yet they may in ſome things differ in their ſignification, and yet agree well together, thus: circumciſion more lively ſignified mortification, and the death of ſinne in the crucifying and death of Chriſt, and of juſtifying the ſinner by the blood of Chriſt; and baptiſme more cleerly ſignifies the buriall of ſinne in the buriall of Chriſt, and riſing from the death of ſinne to the life of grace by the reſurrection of Chriſt, and waſhing away our ſinnes by the ſpirit of Chriſt, he being under water, and aroſe out of the water, and as water waſheth away the filth of our bodies, ſo the blood of Chriſt waſheth away our ſinnes; but to ſay circumciſion was a token, that Chriſt ſhould come of *Iſaac*, Maſter *Tombes* contradicts it himſelfe, ſaying, *John* baptized before circumciſion ſhould of right ceaſe, and yet Chriſt was borne thirty yeeres before, which hangs together like harpe and harrow; and *Paul* circumciſed *Timothy* after Chriſts aſſention, ſee *Acts* 16. 3. and after he had preached of his reſurrection many times; but this had been notoriouſly wicked, if circumciſion had ſignified that Chriſt was yet for to come of *Iſaac*: ſecondly, he ſaith circumciſion ſignified that the Iſraelites were ſeperated from all Nations; but I ſay no, for if any would turne to the Jewes Religion they ſhould be circumcized, let them be of what Nation they would; ſo then it was onely a note of diſtinction of their Religion from all other, and that they onely had the true viſible Church of God, and ſo baptiſme is one mark of the chriſtian Church, whereby it is known

from Turks and Infidels: Thirdly, he ſaith circumciſion ſignified that *Moſes* Law was to be obſerved, from *Gal.* 5. 3. But how can that be, when it was not given till four hundred yeers after: fourthly, he ſaith circumciſion did ſigne the promiſe of the Land of *Canaan* to them, and baptiſme ſignes eternall life by Chriſt: But I ſay, they both ſignifie and ſigne the promiſe of that everlaſting covenant made with Chriſt for the elect, yet not to all that have it, but to Gods people that are amongſt us; and for *Canaan*, I ſay it was but an overplus, of thoſe promiſes which we enjoy as well as the Jewes, when as ſpirituall and eternall mercies were the principall things intended in that everlaſting covenant; and whereas he ſaid, if baptiſme ſucceed circumciſion, then none but males muſt be baptized. I have anſwered, the command by Chriſt is now enlarged to all Nations, and to females; if this man be not faithleſſe, but faithfull, I ſuppoſe this may ſatisfie the doubt from this Scripture, why chriſtian Infants may not be baptized.

Thirdly, his examination of other Scriptures, to encreaſe his doubtings are theſe, *Acts* 16.15,32,33.18.8. 1 Cor.1.16. he ſaith, the words to the Jaylor were ſpoke to all in his houſe, and he rejoyced, beleeving God with all his houſhold; and *Criſpus* beleeved God with all his houſe, and was baptized; hence he concludes, that the name of the whole houſe is to be underſtood, that thoſe which beleeved in it onely were baptized: But I have anſwered already, that if but one of the Parents become a chriſtian, the children are holy, which cannot be denied by any Sctipture or ſound reaſon: And againe, he hath ſaid nothing of *Liddiahs* houſhold; and beſides, although the Jaylor had ſervants whcih beleeved by hearing aend ſeing the Apoſtles carriage in the priſon, yet *Liddia* was a ſtranger, going to heare *Paul* preach, was converted, and he came and baptized her whole houſhold immediately, and it may be never ſaw them before; neither was it materiall, whether children was of age or not, it may ſuffice, that they baptized whole houſholds, of which Infants was a part; and I ſay againe, although they were uncleane before, if but one of the Parents beleeved, and was baptized, yet now they are holy, and if both Parents profeſſe themſelves chriſtians, which is our caſe in *England*, the matter is out of doubt, there Infants ought to be baptized. Againe, when God gave the token of the covenant to *Abraham*, he commanded that the token ſhould be ſet on all the males in his houſe, and he accordingly obeyed, and did ſo, *Gen.* 17.12. 27. and ſaith the Lord, *I know that Abraham will teach his children and his houſhold after him to keep the way of the Lord*, Gen. 18. 19. and ſaith *Joſhua*, *as for me and my houſhold we will ſerve the Lord*, Joſh.24.15. Now I have ſaid and proved before, that Chriſt came not to take away the token of the covenant, but to change it, and to enlarge it, but the covenant and the command are both the ſame, and remaine ſtill; ſee my anſwer to the ninth Objection; then it is cleare, that if houſholds were circumciſed and baptized, then our Infants may and ought to be baptized.

I ſhall anſwer two Queſtions: Suppoſe where heathens and chriſtians live in a land together, yet at ſome diſtance, and the heathen ſhould take away a chriſtians Infant before it be baptized, and reſolve to keep it by violence from them, only they will give the chriſtian leave to come with a Miniſter and baptize it, but they will not part with the child; now may this man goe and baptize it, and engage himſelfe to bring it up in the chriſtian Religion: *Anſw.* No; it were ſin and folly to promiſe that which he cannot performe, the child being kept out of his hands by Infidels; yea, it were as bad and ſinfull to doe as thoſe did under the Prelats government, who did engage themſelves, that the child ſhould forſake the devill and all his works, and all the luſts of the fleſh, and beleeve the Articles of the chriſtian faith, and keepe all Gods Commandements; therefore it ought not to be done. The ſecond Queſtion is this; ſuppoſe a child of heatheniſh Infidels ſhould by ſome providence of God, lawfully come under the government of chriſtians, ought the child to be baptized? *Anſw.* Yes, becauſe they have power to bring it up in the chriſtian Religion, therefore *Abraham* was commanded to circumciſe al the males in his houſe, ſome of them being children of Infidels, becauſe the Lord knew that *Abraham* would command his houſhold to doe that which is right in the ſight of the Lord, *Gen.* 18. 19. and chriſtians have the ſame power to bring up thoſe under their government in the chriſtian Religion; and this alſo may anſwer Maſter *Tombes*, when he ſaith, *Infants baptiſme may be a meanes to baptize them of uncertaine progeny*: But I ſay, if chriſtians have power to bring them up in the chriſtian Religion, and they can bring them up in no other, becauſe the whole Kingdome hath embraced it; neither need they now to have any ſureties to engage themſelves to bring them up in it, ſeeing the whole Kingdome hath embraced it and doe profeſſe it.

Fourthly, Maſter *Tombes* ſaith, Baptiſme is doubtfull, becauſe it cannot be proved that it was in uſe in the next age after the Apoſtles. Fifthly, Maſter *Tombes* ſaith, Infants baptiſme is doubtfull, becauſe in the ſucceeding age afterwards, it was held to be a written tradition. *Anſw.* If it be proved that it was in the Apoſtles times, and that by the command of Chriſt, then the Apoſtacy of the times cannot make it unlawfull; but the firſt is proved ſufficiently, yet more ſhall be ſaid to it in anſwer to Captaine *Hobſon's* third argument; then this doth not juſtly hinder chriſtians Infants from baptiſme.

Sixthly, Maſter *Tombes* ſaith, Infants baptiſme hath occaſioned many humane inventions to underprop it: Firſt, ſureties in baptiſme; ſecondly, epiſcopall confirmation; thirdly, the reformed union by examination before the Communion; fourthly, the Church-covenant as it is in New-England. *Anſw.* theſe are all meere ſcandals caſt upon the Presbyteriall government, which doth utterly ſuppreſſe them all.

Seventhly,

Seventhly, Master *Tombes* saith, Infants baptisme hath occasioned or hath been as the birth to foster many errours; first, that baptisme conferres grace by the work done; secondly, baptisme is regeneration; thirdly, that Infants dying, are saved by the faith of the Parents; fourthly, that some regenerate may fall from grace. *I answ.* The abuse of Infants baptisme doth not nullifie it, neither can it be truly said to be the ground of these errours, for we hold that it may be done upon reprobates as well as circumcision was, neither is it a personall benefit to those that have it, but it is onely given as a benefit to the godly, who live amongst them; and so the baptisme of reprobates may benefit the godly, although it doth not benefit themselves that have it.

Eightly, Master *Tombes* saith, baptisme of Infants causeth many faults in discipline, and in divine worship, and in conversation, such as these; first private baptisme; secondly, baptisme of Infants; thirdly, baptisme by women; fourthly, baptisme of uncertaine Progeny; fifthly, baptisme in the name of the Lord, who know not the Lord nor have ever consented, and perhaps will never consent to the confession of the name of the Lord: sixthly, it hath brought in the admission of ignorant and prophane to the communion of the Lords supper: seventhly, it perverts the order of discipline to to baptize and then to catechize: eighthly, it turnes the Sacrament into a ceremony or prophane feasting: ninthly, it makes men forget that ever they were baptized: tenthly, it takes away or diminisheth zeale and industry to know the Gospell. *I answ.* Most of these are scandals without any proofe, as the five last, and there is but one of the other five altogether unlawfull, and that is baptisme by women; and yet this is held by some Anabaptists to be lawfull, which is not lawfull, but abominable, and he makes a perhaps to the fifth, where there is no cause, for the Parents have power to bring them up to professe the christian Religion, which is as much as the Apostles required before they did admit them to baptisme; then these ten faults are not sufficient to hinder christian Infants from baptisme.

Ninthly, Master *Tombes* saith, that Infants baptisme is an occasion of many unnecessary disputes, fostering contention, which can never be determined by any certaine rule, such as these; first, baptizing Infants of excommunicated persons: secondly, baptizing Infants of apostates: thirdly, baptizing Infants of Parents that are not members of a gathered Church: fourthly, baptizing Infants of those whose Ancestors were beleevers, and the next Parents remaining still in unbeliefe. *I answ.* the first and last of these the Church of *England* makes no doubt of, nor of the second, unlesse they turne Turks, and so renounce the christian Religion; and the third is a meer cavill of Independents, for he that is baptized into the christian faith and Religion, is a member of the christian Church, where-ever he is; then notwithstanding this argument, christian Infants ought to be baptized.

Tenthly,

Tenthly, Master *Tombes* saith, That Baptisme of Infants was opposed in the midst of the darknesse of Popery, by the same men that opposed invocation of Saints, and prayer for the dead, and adoration of the Crosse. *I answer*, In the midst of that darknesse some light might be hid from those that sought to bring in the light of the Gospell; but we need not to fetch proofe from those darke times, for *Luther* denyed some part of Scripture to be the Word of God, and he held consubstantiation, ubiquity of Christs body, and yet he withstood Popery more powerfully then any of those before him. Then this cannot hinder Infants Baptisme.

Eleventhly, Master *Tombes* saith, the assertors of Infants Baptisme do not agree amongst themselves, upon what foundation they may build it. *I answer*, Though severall men bring severall arguments for it, this cannot nullifie it. Againe, they all agree in the command of Christ, and the promise of sanctifying grace, and the blessing and testimony of Christ on them, and of that holinesse of distinction from Turks and Infidels; and if some bring more arguments to confirme it, shall this make it void? and what truth is that which was never opposed by some? then this cannot hinder Infants Baptisme.

Lastly, Master *Tombes* saith, Infants Baptisme seemes to take away one of the prime ends of Baptisme, which was to shew and confesse himselfe to be a Disciple; but this I have already answered severall times, so then, notwithstanding all these doubtfull arguments, here is nothing that may justly hinder Christian Infants from Baptisme.

All these doubts are briefly mentioned by Master *Tombes* in the beginning of his Booke, Intituled, *An exercitation of Infants Baptisme*, before his Answer to Master *Marshall*, therefore I forbeare to set downe the severall pages to finde them.

Here I shall speake something touching re-baptizing, or often baptizing, because Master *Tombes* in his great Booke seemes to favour it, saying, If we had as cleare Scripture for Infants Baptisme as we have for re-baptizing, our controversie would soone be ended; and by other such like passages in his Booke. It appeares that he favours re-baptizing or often Baptisme; then suppose any that is baptized in the Church of *England* should question the lawfulnesse of their Baptisme, saying, I was not rightly baptized because I was an Infant, and knew not what was done, but this I have already answered; then suppose another say, I was sprinkled, which is to rinse and not to baptize, therefore I was not rightly baptized; this I shall answer in the second point. Then suppose another say, I was baptized either by a drunken Priest, that cannot preach and baptize as he ought, *Mat.* 28. 19. or else by a Popish Priest, who had his Ordination from Popish Bishops, therefore I was not rightly baptized, and may be re-baptized. But here I would know how our Anabaptists Preachers can prove their

owne calling lawfull; If they say that they are teaching Disciples, then where is their Ordination? it was either from men of other callings, who have nothing to do in it, or else they have none at all; and how was their first teacher made? it was sure the Divell that first moved him from his place and calling to become their Teacher. And if they say, his Calling was extraordinary, like that of the Apostles, then we would see their extraordinary Gifts, and till then we cannot believe their Calling to be lawfull, and so themselves ought not to preach nor baptize; thus while they judge our Ministers they condemne themselves; And for our Bishops and Ministers I answer and say; That they were ordained by men of their owne calling, to preach and to administer the Sacraments, and thus it hath beene successively from the Apostles, and although the Bishops had power and authority given them by men to rule over their Brethren, which they ought not, yet that did not make void that which they had from God, for then that or any other sinne, would make that or any other calling void, so that a man must either live without sinne or be cashiered of his calling; so then our Ministers standing is lawfull, and their Baptisme warrantable. I need not speake of the Service Booke, the Crosse, and Surplesse, which were the onely things that troubled them, but they are removed, and yet they stand out as much as ever, which shewes they have proud and froward hearts, rather then any just cause given to them, why they should forsake our Churches. But suppose there were some exception against our Ministers entrance or execution of their office, yet that will not make their Baptisme void; the Lord was wrath with *Moses* and would have killed him because his child was not circumcised; but when that was done his wrath ceased, although it was done by his wife, a woman, and an outlandish woman, and in her rage against God for commanding such a service, and against *Moses* for being willing to yeeld unto such a service, see *Exod.* 4. 24, 25, 26. Then may not our Ministers baptize as lawfully and acceptably as this woman might circumcise. Now I grant, if our Ministers should baptize in their own name, then their Baptisme would be void, 1 *Cor.* 13. 15. but they use the right forme which Christ gave the Apostles, in the name of the Trinity, *Matth.* 28. 19. and they use the right matter, which is water, *Mat.* 3. 22. and on the right Subject, Christians Infants, as hath been proved, and to the right end, which is, to distinguish them from Heathens and Infidels, and to engage them to obey the Covenant, of which Baptisme is a signe or token; and all this is done by Ministers lawfully called, therefore they ought not to be re-baptized. Againe, Baptisme is a Sacrament of the new birth; and although we may come often to the other Sacrament, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. yet we can be borne but once; therefore we must take this Sacrament but once, which is the signe of it. Againe, there is but one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptisme, *Ephes.* 4. therefore the

Sacrament

Sacrament of Baptiſme is to be adminiſtred but once. Their Objections are now to be anſwered.

Firſt, they object, That if Chriſt ſaid he had another Baptiſme beſide that he had of *John*, *Matth.* 3. 17. Then we may be againe baptized, but he ſaith, I have a Baptiſme to be baptized with, and how am I ſtraightned till it be accompliſhed, *Luke* 12. 50. then they may be againe baptized. *I anſwer*, That Baptiſme of Chriſt was his ſufferings, *for*, ſaith he, *to the Sonnes of Zebedy can yee drinke of the Cup that I drinke of, and be baptized with the Baptiſme that I am baptized with*, and they ſaid, *we are able*; Then he ſaid, *you ſhall indeed drinke of the Cup that I drinke of, and be baptized with the Baptiſme that I am baptized with*, *Mark.* 10. 38,39. Therefore, ſaith *Paul*, *We are baptized into his death, and buryed with him by Baptiſme*, *Rom.* 6. 3,4. So then Chriſt was but once baptized with water, no more muſt we; but then as Chriſt was killed and crucified afterwards, ſo muſt we kill and crucifie our ſinnes daily afterwards; Then here is no warrant to be re-baptized.

Secondly, They object, That if thoſe that looke for a reſurrection muſt be baptized at their death, then there is more Baptiſmes then one; but *Paul* ſaith, if the dead riſe not, why are they baptized for the dead, what ſhall they doe that are baptized for the dead, 1 *Cor.* 15. 29. therefore they may be againe baptized. *I anſwer*, Baptizing ſignifies waſhing, and it was the cuſtome to waſh the dead Corps, for when *Dorcas* was dead they waſhed her body, *Act.* 9. 37. but they that will be ſo baptized muſt tarry till they be dead, neither ſhall it be done by the Miniſter, but by them that ſhall winde them up and put them into the Coffin to be buried; but here is no Warrant to be re-baptized, from this Text, till after they be dead.

Thirdly, they object, That if ſome were twice baptized, then ſo may we, but ſome were firſt baptized by *John*, and afterwards by *Paul*, *Act.* 19. *v.* 3,5. then we may be againe baptized. *I anſwer*, ſome doe expound thoſe words to be thus underſtood, ſaying, They were firſt baptized by ſome falſe Diſciples of *John* into his name, and ſo it was void, and therefore they were baptized againe in the name of Chriſt, but this cannot be the meaning, for then *Paul* would have inquired after thoſe Hereticks, for *Paul* was newly come from *Corinth*, *v.* 1. where he had cleared himſelfe from the ſame thing, 1 *Corinth.* 1. 13, 15. then ſure he would not ſo put it up at *Epheſus*. 2. Some expound thoſe words thus, ſaying, They were when *Paul* came to *Epheſus* onely taught the Doctrine of *John*, but not baptized of him, and ſo were baptized by *Paul*; but this is not the meaning neither, for they were believers and they were Diſciples, *v.* 1,2. therefore they were baptized of *John*, and yet they had not learned his Doctrine, for they neither knew Jeſus Chriſt nor the Holy Ghoſt till *Paul* had told them, *v.* 3. 4. Thirdly, The Anabaptiſts expound it thus; ſaying, They were baptized

with water first by *John*, and then againe with water by *Paul*; but this is not the meaning neither, for their second Baptisme is not done with water; but while *Paul* was expounding to them who it was that *John* said should come after him, and baptize them with the Holy Ghost, that is, saith *Paul* Jesus Christ, *v.* 4. Now when they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, *v.* 5. that is, while *Paul* was expounding, their souls was converted and baptized with the Holy Ghost; neither is here any word that *Paul* baptized them, onely he made knowne Christ to them, and when the worke was done they were baptized, as it was while *Peter* spake the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the Word, *Act.* 10. 44. So then here is the full meaning of these words, they were baptized with water by *Iohn*, for they were Disciples and believers, that is, they believed that the Christian Religion was the true Religion, so that they were converted from heathenisme to christianity, but they were not converted from the state of corruption to the state of grace, though *Iohn* had said, He that comes after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, but him they knew not, till *Paul* said, that is Jesus Christ; by that word when they heard that they were converted and their souls washed or baptized with the Holy Ohost. But it may be they will object, saying, The Holy Ghost was given to them afterwards, *v.* 6. *I answer*, That was the gift of miracles, to cure all diseases, to cast out Divels, and to speake with divers Tongues, yet this also is called Baptisme, for saith Christ, *You shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many daies hence*, *Act.* 1. 5. that is, the gift of miracles, but they had the sanctifying gift before, for it was the sanctifying gift that *Iohn* had from the wombe, *Luk.* 1. 15 this is that promise made to us and our children, *Act.* 2. 38. so then some times the outward forme is called Baptisme, and sometimes sanctification is called Baptisme, and some times the gift of miracles is called Baptisme, as *Act.* 1. 5. and all these three are together in that 19. of the Acts; for first they were baptized by water of *Iohn*, and then baptized by the Holy Ghost by *Pauls* teaching, and then they received the gift of miracles by *Pauls* laying on of his hands, and all this is but one Baptisme, onely the outward forme is distinguished from the inward and reall worke of the Holy Ghost. Then this Text will not warrant their re-baptizing the second time with water.

Fourthly, they object, That if *Paul* spake of Baptismes in the Plural Number, then there is more Baptismes then one; but *Paul* speaks of Baptismes in the plural number, *Hebr.* 6. 2. therefore there is more then one. *I answer*; It is like *Paul* speaks of the outward and inward Baptisme, and the gift of miracles, and cals them altogether Baptismes in the plural number; or it may be he puts the sufferings of Christians, and washing their corps after death, which are called Baptismes, because the very next thing *Paul* speaketh of is the resurection; howsoever if *Paul* here speaks

of

of divers kinds of baptiſmes which it is moſt likely he doth, then this Text will not warrant a ſecond baptiſme with water, but *Paul* here ſpeakes of the Doctrine of Baptiſme and not of the forme, therefore it makes nothing for the outward forme to re-baptize them againe with water.

Now as I was deſired I ſhall give a brief Anſwer to Captaine *Hobſons* five Arguments; Firſt ſaies he, the Baptiſme of Infants doth directly deny Chriſt to be come in the fleſh, becauſe it keepes on foot that which was before Chriſt, and ended by Chriſt as come in the fleſh; That is, ſaith he, the Covenant God made with *Abraham* which ran in the fleſh, and was intailed to Generation, Gen. 17. 7, 12. to this Covenant ſaith he, Circumciſion had reference, now thoſe naturall branches are cut off Rom. 11. 20, 21. and now there are no Seed or Sonnes of *Abraham*, but beleevers, Gal. 3 9. 14. 22. 28. 29. now the Promiſe is not a carnall, but a ſpirituall, John 3. 5.

I anſw. To ſay the Covenant which Circumciſion had reverence to was a Carnall Covenant, ſhewes but a carnall underſtanding of it, for it is called an everlaſting Covenant many times in that Chapter, Gen. 17. neither was this Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*, but ſaith the Lord, *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant with thee, and thy ſeed, every man childe ſhall be circumciſed, and this ſhall be a token of the Covenant, and this token ſhall be in your fleſh for that everlaſting Covenant, and my Covenant ſhall be eſtabliſhed with Iſaac.* Then the Covenant was no more made with *Abraham* then it was with *Iſaac*, but eſtabliſhed to both by that token of Circumciſion, ſo then that circumciſion was not a token of a carnall covenant, but a token of that eternall Covenant made between God the Father, and Chriſt his Sonne in our nature from all eternity: For, ſaith Chriſt, I was ſet up from everlaſting before the world was, Pro. 8. 23. he was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, 1 Pet. 1. 20. God made promiſes to Chriſt before the world began, Titus 1. 2. ſo then this eternall Covenant was not manifeſted by a token of it from the beginning of the world till *Abraham* had it, becauſe till then no whole Nation was called into the viſible Church; but if *Abraham* and his poſterity had onely a token that they ſhould enjoy the Land of Canaan it had been but *Eſaus* bleſſing. Againe, to ſay that eternall Covenant was made to *Abraham* is to make him our Redeemer, for then he muſt performe the conditions of it for all the Elect, but (poore man) he had failings as well as other men, and not able to ſatisfie for his owne ſinnes, much leſſe for the ſinnes of all the Elect; ſo then that covenant was made with his ſeed, and ſaith *Paul*, that ſeed was Chriſt, Gal. 3. 16. Againe marke the concluſion of Maſter *Hobſon*, who ſaid, *Abraham* received a token but of a carnall covenant, but if that were true, *Abraham* is damned; and then by and by he ſaith, the Seed and Sons of *Abraham* muſt be beleevers, Gal. 3. 7. 9. 14. 22. 28. 29. then ſure he

received the token of that everlasting Covenant. But how are we Gentiles the Seed and Sons of *Abraham*? *I answer*, By receiving the signe and token of that everlasting covenant as a seale to our faith, as he did, Rom. 4. 11. and we are his children by receiving the same faith in Christ as he had, but we are not *Abrahams* children as Christ is our everlasting Father, who stood as a generall Person representing all the Elect, and receiving a covenant for them, and able to fulfill the conditions of it, and to satisfie Gods Justice for the breach of *Adams* covenant, and able to worke faith in us to enter into his covenant: But when *Abraham* is named, we must understand him as an Embassadour, representing Christ the King of his Church, with whom alone the new covenant was made, as the first was made with *Adam*, and all we come under it when we take upon us his naturall Image; so the second covenant was made with Christ, and the Elect come under it when they receive his spirituall Image: so then the tokens of the covenant were before Christ came in the Flesh, and Christ did not come to take away the token of the covenant, but to change them from Circumcision to Baptisme, and to enlarge them to all Nations, and to Females as well as Males, Acts 8. 12. then the keeping on foot this token of the covenant which Christ instituted after his comming in the flesh doth not deny his comming in the flesh, neither is this to hold circumcision which was the token before his comming in the flesh, then this Argument falls to nothing, whereby he would prove Infants Baptisme to deny the comming of Christ in the flesh. But then he saith, the Pharisees and Saducees pleading that they were *Abrahams* Seed, and would be Baptized, and yet *John* would not till they repent and beleeve, Mat. 3, 7. 8. 9. *I answer*. If they had repented of their Sects and Schismes he would have Baptized them, for no ignorant Person was refused by him, although they had not heard whether there was any Holy Ghost, yet *John* baptized them unto repentance and bid them beleeve, and such were made Disciples, Acts 19. 1, 2, 3, 4. but *John* knew that such Sectaries would be but as Vipers to the true Religion, therefore he would not baptize them unlesse they would leave their Heresie and Schisme. Then it was not because they were of the Seed of *Abraham* that he refused it, but because they would not leave their Heresies and Schismes, this cannot keepe Infants from Baptisme which have no Sects nor Schismes to repent of. But he hath another Argument to prove that the baptizing of Infants directly denies the comming of Christ in the flesh, and that is this, He saith it takes from Christ his Prophetical and Kingly Offices, which the Holy Ghost gave him, as come in the Flesh. *I answ.* Christ had those Offices before he came in the flesh, he was King, and Priest to the Church of the Jewes, although not so manifest as to the Christian Church, but how the baptizing of infants should rob Christ of those Offices is a Paradox to all wise men. But

he

he saith, because it makes the Old Testament to expound the New, but what of this, Christ sate with sinners, and some were offended at it, and he sends them to the Old Testament, saying, *Learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, Mat. 9. 13. but did Christ by this lose his Prophetical Office, by sending them to the Old Testament to expound his doings in the New? there is no truth in this Argument, nor in the thing that he would prove by it. But then he saith, baptizing of Infants robs Christ of his Kingly Office in giving Lawes, and making it a duty to baptize Infants. *Ans.* They have a command from Christ to teach and baptize all Nations, but how is a Nation taught but when those of yeares receive the christian Religion, and make profession of it by a positive Law of that Land, or else it were unpossible that any Nation should be either taught or baptized, and so the Commission of Christ would be to no purpose, and if children were excluded, how shall the Nations come in, as is promised? Isa 22. Micah 4. 2. but the truth is, if the Parents be of the Christian Religion it is potentially in the childe, and the Parents have power to bring them up in that Religion, and therefore ought to baptize them in it, but I shall speake more of this in answer to his third Argument, but this may suffice to prove that we have a command to baptize Infants: Then we doe not intrench upon the Kingly Office of Christ, and there is neither sence nor reason to say, if we did intrench upon his Kingly Office, that this were to deny his comming in the flesh, when as his Kingly Office was before as well as since his comming in the flesh, then all this hinders not Infants Baptisme, so much in answer to his first Argument, I shall be briefer in the rest.

His second Argument is this, Infants Baptisme hath no part of Righteousnesse in it, therefore it ought not to be done, his Propotion is proved thus; Whatsoever is considered as a part of Righteousnesse was seene in the Person or Practice of Christ, but infants Baptisme was neither seene in his Person nor Practice, for he was not baptized in his infancy, neither did he baptize any infants, and yet he saith it becomes us to fulfill all righteousnesse, Mat. 3. 15. therefore infants may not be baptised. *Ans.* Christ came to fulfill the Morall Law, and so to free his people from that bond of perfect obedience to it, and he suffered the penalty due to our sinnes to free us from the curse of it, thus by his Active and Passive obedience he fulfilled all righteousnesse, this he did in his owne Person alone, and there was none with him, Isa 63. 3. Psal. 47. 8. but here in his answer to *John Baptist* he doth not say, it becommeth me, but *it becommeth us to fulfill all righteousnesse*, Mat. 3. 15. Nay the action was *Johns*, and not his, for Jesus came to him to be baptized, verse 13. so then I conceive the meaning to be this, *John* was sent or commanded to baptize with Water, see John 1. 33. and he that beleeved that Jesus was the Sonne of God

 was

was to be baptized, Acts 8. 37. but Jesus, as a man, beleeved this, and therefore in obedience to that command was to doe it, and Jesus to suffer it, thus saith Jesus, *It becommeth us to fulfill all righteousnesse*, but it did not become *John* to baptize before he was sent to doe it, nor Jesus to suffer before the command was given to *John* to baptize, John 3. 33. Then he could not be baptized in his infancy, because the command was not then given. Againe, if he had been baptized in his infancy, then it might be questioned whether men of yeares might be baptized; neither would the Heathen have suffered their children, unlesse themselves had been admitted to baptisme; and Christ was baptized in the middle of his age, that neither infants nor old age might be excluded from baptisme. Againe, Jesus came to be Baptized as soone as there was one appointed and sent to doe it, then if we have lawfull Ministers found to baptize our Infants, we ought to suffer them to doe it, because it becommeth us to fulfill the righteous command of Christ; but if it be with us as it was with Christ, that we have no lawfull Minister to doe it till we be of his age, then we may lawfully stay as long as he did before we baptize our infants. But then the Captaine saith, If God would have had Jesus baptized sooner, he would have sent one sooner to doe it. To this I may say, If God would not have our infants baptized, then he would not send Ministers to them so soone to doe it. And whereas the Captaine saith, It is no part of righteousnesse because Christ baptized no infants. To this I may answer, Christ baptized none at all with water, John 4. 2. then if this Argument were good, it is no part of righteousnesse to baptize infants either young or old; but I shall prove it to be a part of righteousnesse to baptize infants in answer to his next Argument, but for the present you see his proves removed by which he would prove infants baptisme to have no part of righteousnesse in it, and therefore his Proposition must needs fall; and notwithstanding this Argument christian infants ought to be baptized.

His third Argument is this, The baptisme of infants is not the baptisme of Christ, because it doth not answer his commission, Mat. 28. 19, 20. which is, Goe teach, discipling and baptizing, hence he concludes, that they must be taught, and disciplined, and beleevers before they can be baptized, Marke 16. 16. and this no infant can be, and so cannot answer the commission, therefore must not be baptized. *I answ.* That infants baptisme is according to the commission of Christ, for according to his Exposition whole Nations must be taught, and disciplined, and made beleevers, else they were sent to doe that which is impossible. But how can a whole Nation be taught, disciplined, and made beleevers? *I answ.* There is a two-fold conversion, and two Sacraments answerable to this two-fold conversion; the first conversion is a turning from false religion to the true religion, and the other is a conversion from corrupted nature

to

to the ſtate of grace? now he that hath the firſt of theſe to beleeve Chriſt to be the Son of God, and that the Chriſtian Religion is the true Religion, this man may be diſcipled being thus taught, and ſo may receive the firſt Sacrament; yea thus a whole Kingdom may be taught and may beleeve the true Religion, and ſo diſcipled, and receive the Sacrament of Baptiſme; yea when the Governours of a Kingdom ſhall be taught and beleeve the Chriſtian Religion to be the true Religion, and ſhall ſettle it amongſt them by a poſitive Law of the Land, and all parents and people of yeers in that Kingdom conſent unto it, then all that Kingdom is taught and muſt all be baptized; for, what the parents have done, the children have potentially done, becauſe it is in the power of thoſe parents to bring them up in that Religion, and not ſuffer their infants to be of any other; and having this power, they may alſo ſet the token or mark of diſtinction upon them, to baptize them that they may be known from *Turks* and *Heathens*. Now if parents had not this power, then no Kingdom could ever receive the Goſpel and be a holy Nation as the *Jew's* was; and ſo their privilege would exceed the privilege of all Chriſtian Kingdoms; for there will be children to the end of the world; for till then, they will marry and be given in marriage till the laſt day. Then, as *Abraham* and the *Jews* received their Religion for themſelves and their children, ſo muſt Chriſtians, and ſet the token of the Covenant upon them as they did. But then, for the other converſion which makes them fit for the other Sacrament, the Lords Supper, it is not in the power of the parents; although they can bring them up in the Chriſtian Religion, yet they cannot convert them from the ſtate of corruption to the ſtate of grace; and although they be able to diſcern when they conform to the true Religion, yet they cannot ſee into their ſouls whether there be true Faith in them; that new name written none knows but he that hath it: then, although it be ſaid, *Teach and baptize all Nations*; yet it is not ſaid, *Teach and give the Lords Supper to all Nations*; for it is not in the power of man to teach effectually the heart of another, nor to know when they are ſo taught; none but himſelf knows whether he diſcern the Lords Body, or whether he feed by Faith or remember the Death of Chriſt, or whether he have truely examined himſelf; therefore the worthineſſe or unworthineſſe lies upon himſelf, and the charge alſo. Let every man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat. Neither muſt any baptized Chriſtian be kept from the Lords Supper, unleſſe he by the leaven of errour ſeek to undermine the truth of Chriſtian Religion, or by prophaneſſe trample the Chriſtian profeſſion underfoot, *Matth.* 16. 12. 1 *Cor.* 5. 12, 13. 2 *Cor.* 2. 5, 6. *Gal.* 5. 9, 10. and then it muſt be done in a legall way, not by the Miniſter alone nor by the Congregation alone, but by the Elderſhip, the offence being ſcandalous. So then, the firſt converſion being in the power of the parents, and potentially in the children already, they may and ought to be baptized.

But then he ſaith, *The Baptiſm of infants cannot be a Baptiſm of Faith and Repentance, and therefore it is not the Baptiſm of Chriſt.* But in regard he hath no proof for it, I refer him to my anſwer to the ſecond and third Objection, and conclude that Baptiſm of infants is not excluded from the Commiſſion of Chriſt; and it is a Baptiſm unto Faith and Repentance, and therefore they ought to be baptized.

His fourth Argument. He ſaith, *Baptiſm of infants doth cauſe inconveniences in the Church; firſt, becauſe we make them Members of the Church before they be called of God, which is contrary to theſe Scriptures,* 1 *Cor.* 1. 1. *and* 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. I anſwer, Though the *Corinthians* were ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus, and called to be Saints, yet all in the Church were not ſuch; for there was hereſies and prophaneſſe: the inceſtuous perſon was not caſt out; and the Lords Supper was prophaned; and more carnall men then ſpirituall; and many diviſions, ſome of *Paul* and ſome of *Apollo*. Then, Were theſe all Saints? No. He writes in the judgement of charity, and directs his Epiſtle chiefly to ſuch as were Saints indeed; ſo then in the judgement of charity, we ſhould think the beſt of thoſe in the Church that uſe the means to attain ſalvation; and ſo you may judge of infants who are brought up in the true Religion: And although Heathens muſt have a call to Chriſtianity, yet when Chriſtians are called, their children need not to tarry for ſuch a call, becauſe they have no falſe Religion to be called from. Neither was it any inconvenience to the *Jews* that their infants had the token of the Covenant upon them before their calling; but rather a grace and glory to their Church, and a benefit to thoſe infants to engage them to obedience of that Covenant when they came to age, of which they had received a token. So all the people and the Publicans juſtified Chriſt when they heard him being baptized of *John*; when as the Phariſees and Lawyers rejected the Counſell of God againſt themſelves, being not baptized of him; *Luke* 7. 29, 30. Then as we would have them juſtifie Chriſt and not to reject his Counſell, let them be baptized. But he ſaith, *Another inconvenience it is to have our infants baptized, becauſe it will intaile privileges to us in reference to generation.* But to theſe privileges he ſaith, *They muſt be ſanctified*, quoting that place I anſwered already, 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. Yet I ſay they are ſanctified or ſet apart from *Turks* and *Heathens* for the Chriſtian Church; *elſe were they unclean, but now they are holy,* 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. then they ought to be baptized. But he hath a third inconvenience, and that is, *If infants be baptized, it will make a ſeparation and diſtraction in Chriſts conjunction, and that is to baptize ſuch as they will not give the Lords Supper, nor admit them nor others to break Bread; Chriſt would have them to do both, and they will admit ſuch as cannot do both.* But he hath no reaſon why ſome may not do ſome duties when they are diſabled to do others; and therefore I refer him to my anſwer to the tenth Objection, and hither too: for all his inconveniences,

nitences, I see no good Argument to keep infants of Christians from Baptism.

Fifthly: He saith, *The baptizing of infants doth directly crosse the proceedings both in the time of the Law and in the time of the Gospel, and therefore it ought not to be done; for they did all, both under the Law and in the time of the Gospel, by a rule; else* Lot *might have pleaded the same priviledge with* Abraham, *being a Beleever as well as he; and* Ishmael *who was no Beleever in God, yet he was circumcised.* I answer: The promise to *Abraham* was, that his seed in *Isaac* should be the visible Church, who onely should have the token of the Covenant; and this excludes *Lot* from this privilege: and for *Ishmael*, he being one of his Family, by vertue of another command, was circumcised, when the Lord would have *Abraham* to make his own house an example or a patern for all his posterity, to circumcise in his house, *Gen.* 17. 12, 13. *But*, saith the Lord, *I will establish my Covenant with* Isaac, *ver.* 21. Onely Strangers had this benefit by living amongst them. So then, by the like reason our children (although as bad as *Ishmael*) may be baptized; when as some true Beleevers amongst the *Turks* may not be baptized except they come to us, and make an open profession of the Christian Religion; then they may have this benefit amongst us. But have not we a rule for what we do, when as the command of Christ is our direction, who commands all Nations to be taught and baptized? and if he command it, he will have it done, although the Anabaptists would bar the Christian Church from that benefit to be a holy Nation, as the Church of the *Jews* was flat against many promises that whole Nations should come into the Christian Church, and Christs command to teach and baptize all Nations. But I have answered this in reply to Master *Hobson's* third Argument; and so notwithstanding their Objections and Arguments made against baptizing of Christian infants, I see no sufficient ground to bar them from the Ordinance of Baptism.

The second Point is, that sprinkling the baptized more agreeth with the minde of Christ, then dipping or plunging the baptized in or under the water.

Now I come to the second Point to prove that sprinkling the baptized more agreeth to the minde of Christ, then dipping or plunging the baptized in or under the water:

First, Because Baptism is a Sacrament or visible signe to our corporall eyes, to put us in minde of the thing signified, as the Rainbow shall be seen in the clouds, which was the token of the Covenant, *Gen.* 9. 11, 14. and *Moses* took blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, *Behold the blood of the Covenant*, *Exodus* 24. 7. But when the baptized are plunged

under water, they can neither behold the signes or token of the Covenant, nor hear the words of Institution to put them in minde of the Covenant or thing signified; they cannot have their sences exercised as they ought, *Heb.* 5. 14. because their life is in danger to be lost; and a drunken man or a mad man is as fit to make use of the signe, as a man under water, being out of his element; therefore the baptized ought not to be plunged under water.

Secondly, If they should stand on the bank and plunge the baptized into the water, in so doing they may break his neck against the bottom, if the water be shallow; or if deep, they may drown him; neither dare they jump in to save his life lest they drown themselves; and if they should have one in the River to catch him, then there cannot be lesse then two to baptize one man, which is contrary to all examples in Scripture. Then, it being so dangerous to plunge the baptized into the water, whether it be deep or shallow, I would intreat them to shew me when there is neither too much nor too little water, to avoid these dangers; for till then, I shall hold it unlawfull to plunge the baptized in or under water.

Thirdly, The Jaylor and all his were baptized in the night; but if they had been so plunged, sure they would have either killed or drowned them; neither could they avoid it, because at midnight they could not see their rising; neither do I read that they jumped in to endanger their own lives to save them: then sure they were not plunged into it.

Fourthly, If they so plunge the baptized into the water, being naked, it is against modesty; *But, saith Paul, let all things be done decently*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. and so doing were a temptation; for *David* seeing a naked woman washing her self, was tempted to that foul sin of adultery, 2 *Sam.* 11. 2, 4. and Christ hath taught us to say, *Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, Matth.* 6. Then sure the administration of this holy Ordinance must be free from so foul a temptation as to see the nakednesse of each other. Then it is unlawfull to plunge the baptized naked into the water.

Fifthly, If they have drawers for that use, they are sure the holy Breeches of *Aaron*, as bad as the Prelates Surplesse; and for Women to wear them, being mans Apparel, *is an abomination to the Lord, Deut.* 22. 5. therefore not to be plunged in drawers appointed for that use.

Sixthly, If they say that they were plunged in their Wearing Clothes, is more then they can prove; yea, it seems they were not so plunged in their Wearing Clothes; for when *Lydia* and the *Jaylor* were baptized, although at several times, they feasted the Apostles straight-way, *Acts* 16. 15, 33. 34. But we do not finde that they shifted themselves either before or after that Ordinance: Then, did they sit at meat together dung-wet as they came out of the water? if they say, yea, then they must prove it, and till then, we

shall

ſhall not beleeve that they were plunged into the water in their Wearing Clothes.

Sevently, If they had any Clothes upon them when they were plunged into the water, then the water could not touch them all over, and ſo they had as good be ſprinkled on one place for all.

Eightly, Many were baptized in their Houſes, as *Paul* and *Cornelius*, and others, *Acts* 9. 17, 18. and 10. 25, 48. And the *Jaylor* was baptized at midnight in the Priſon; But what Veſſel could theſe be ſo plunged in, and where had they ſuch a Veſſel in the Priſon, and filled with water ſo ſuddenly, as to be all baptized the ſame hour, and at midnight? And what Veſſel had *Peter* to baptize three thouſand in ſome few hours ſpace? *Acts* 2.41. If their Veſſel could hold but two or three together, did they empty it ſo many times? And who fetcht all that water? And it may be ſome of them were diſeaſed, and others would not be plunged in the ſame water, and ſo they emptied it three thouſand times over: But did *Peter* ſtand in the Veſſel all that time, or was he in the water at all, or *Ananias* when he baptized *Paul* in the Houſe, or *Peter* when he baptized *Cornelius* in the Houſe, or *Paul* when he baptized the *Jaylor*? Till this be proved, we ſhall not beleeve that they were plunged in the water.

Ninthly, The Sacraments muſt be Adminiſtred where the Word is Preached; for ſaith Chriſt, *Teach all Nations baptizing them*, *Matth.* 28.19. He doth not ſay Preach in one place, and then take them to a River to plunge them: And to hold that one Ordinance alone is to be adminiſtred apart from the meeting place of the Aſſembly for all other publike duties, is ſure the Popiſh Pilgrimage, or at leaſt his going a Preceſſioning; for it was never juſtified of Chriſt, and therefore to be abhorred of Chriſtians.

Tenthly, Water is a ſigne of the *Blood of Chriſt*, which is called *the Blood of ſprinkling*, having ſprinkled our hearts from an evil conſcience, *Heb.* 10. 20. and 12.24. And *Moſes* ſprinkled the people, and ſaid, *Behold the blood of the Covenant*, *Exod.* 24 8. And the Lord ſaith, *I will ſprinkle you with clean water, and ye ſhall be clean*, *Ezek.* 36. 25. Then why ſhould not this Prophecy be fulfilled in ſprinkling the baptized? And why ſhould not the ſigne of Water reſemble the ſubſtance by ſprinkling? Therefore the baptized ought rather to be ſprinkled, then plunged into the Water; and becauſe Chriſt ſaith, *If I waſh one part, thou art clean every whit*, *John* 13. 8. Then ſprinkling and not plunging, is moſt agreeing to the minde of Chriſt.

Laſtly, I fear they do not ſo plunge the baptized as they do profeſſe, but rather let them wade into the water themſelves, and ſo themſelves baptize half their body, without their help, and without any word of Inſtitution from them, and then they come afterwards and baptize the other

half in the name of the Trinity: But if this be their manner, they contradict their own Tenet, and condemn themselves in so doing: And what a shameful thing it is for them to report that they plunge the baptized into the Water, when as they wade in themselves? And so while they judge us for baptizing one part for all, they condemn themselves for doing the same thing, *Rom.* 2. 1. From these grounds we may safely conclude, That sprinkling the baptized is more agreeing to the minde of Christ, then to plunge the baptized into the water.

But to these Arguments Master *Patience* said some thing, although to small purpose.

First, saith he, I take dipping to be the command of Christ, because Master *Daniel Rogers* doth say That the *Greek* word doth signifie washing by plunging; and he saith, Sprinkling is rinsing, and not to baptize, as Master *Blackwood* doth prove from *Greek* Authors; but I then replyed saying, *Are you a Teacher in Israel, and know not these things? John* 3. 10. Have you the care of souls committed unto you, and do you feed them by hearsay, because you are not able to interpret the Word your self? What is this *But the blinde leads the blinde, till both fall into the ditch?* And what comfort will it be to you at the day of Judgement, having seduced many souls, in giving them poyson instead of wholesome food; for you to say then that men told you it was good for them, when as Christ never told you so? And if we should go by hearsay, we might bring multitudes of Orthodox Divines and Churches that well understand the Language in which Christ spake unto his Church, to witnesse, That the word *Baptize* signifies as well *Sprinkling* as *Plunging*.

Secondly, But then he said *Baptism* signified *Burial*, and putting on whole Christ on whole man: But this I grant, For in sprinkling, the baptized are under water, as well as in plunging; for the Minister holds the water over the baptized, and so the baptized is wholly under it; when as in plunging them into the water, it may be some part of them was not wholly under it: And besides, when the Minister holds the water over them, it is all one as to put them under it, when as it may be the *Anabaptists* wade in and put themselves half under, flat against their own Tenet: And then they grant, that the putting the other half into the water, is a putting on whole Christ: Then by the same Argument, by sprinkling one part, Christ may be wholly put on as well as by their practise; and the *Jews* by circumcising one part, they were circumcised all over, and so put on whole Christ. Again, although it be said Baptism saves, it is not by the outward washing, because every part of the body was washed, but rather by the answer of a good conscience. But this is not done by Burial, but rather by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, 1 *Peter* 3. 21.

Thirdly, Then he said that *John Dipped* in *Jordan*; but I may as well say, he

he *Sprinkled* in *Jordan*; for he saith, *I indeed baptize with water*, *Matth.* 3. 11. But the word *with* is not always *in* there; there was *with* the Angel a multitude, *Luke* 1. 13. I hope you will not say they were in the Angel; and if I were with you, I hope you would not say that I were in you: So then to baptize with water may be by sprinkling the baptized, and not by plunging them into the water; and to put in for *with* is as bad a mistake as that of the Prelates, who would bow at the Name of *Jesus* instead of *In the Name of Jesus*, from that place *Phil.* 2. 10. So you will baptize with *the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, instead of *in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*: Because to baptize with water, you will have it all one as to be baptized in the water, by plunging the baptized under, or into the water.

Fourthly, Then he said, *If Christ command to dip, then sprinkling is but a grosse invention of man*; but then he did not prove that Christ did onely command to dip, and not to sprinkle, but to baptize, which signifies *both*: Then we may sprinkle the baptized with as good, if not better warrant, then they may plunge them into the water.

Fifthly, Suppose they say Christ came out of the water, *Matth.* 3. 16. And it is said *Philip* and the *Eunuch* went both into the water, *Acts* 8. 38 Hence they conclude, That the Baptized ought to be plunged into the water. *I answer*, If they waded into the water, then they were not plunged into it: Neither is it said that either Christ or the Eunuch were plunged into the water; neither doth their going into the water hinder but they may be sprinkled; for in those hot Countreys they went bare-foot, and it is likely they went in some distance from the side, that they might come at clear water, and then both *John* and *Philip* might sprinkle them *In the Name of the Trinity*: And I think the *Anabaptists* have nothing to say from Scripture or Reason against it.

I shall here conclude with one Quere, which is this, *If our Ministers be lawfully sent and authorized from Christ, and the Presbytery, to Preach and Baptize, and they do administer this Ordinance of Baptism in the right Form* In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, *and With the right Matter, being Water, and on the right Parties, being either men of yeers when they are converted to the* Christian Religion, *or to Infants born of Christians; and to the right end, which is to distinguish them from Turks and Infidels, and as an engagement to us all to go on in obedience of the true* Christian Religion: *And lastly, That Christ should ratifie that outward Form of Baptism according as* John *the* Baptist *foretold, and baptized them* with the Holy Ghost,

I would know this of the *Anabaptists*, how they dare to renounce this outward Form of Baptism thus rightly administred in our Church, and ratified by the Holy Ghost, and all because it was done upon them when they

they were Infants; therefore the very Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt is deſpiſed; or it may be becauſe they were not plunged into the water? Therefore the outward Form and the inward Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt is deſpiſed of them; when as they may ſee the vanity of plunging by the forementioned Arguments againſt it. But will they caſt away both the outward and inward Seal and Token of the Covenant, when adminiſtered by perſons lawfully called to do it, who do it in the right Form, on the right Parties, with the right Matter, and to the right end; and all this confirmed by the Holy Ghoſt as by a faithful witneſſe that cannot lie? But will they diſpiſe the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, becauſe it was done upon Infants, or becauſe they were ſprinkled and not plunged into the water? And ſo like Witches renounce the Covenant of Grace, and caſt away both the outward and inward Seals of it, when they enter into Covenant with the Divel; ſo theſe people, it is to be feared, many of them do commit that unpardonable ſin, when they turn *Anabaptiſts*, deſpiſing and trampling under feet the Spirit of God, whereby they *ſhould be Sealed to the day of Redemption*; For commonly they go on in a final Apoſtacy, and not one of Ten thouſand ever returns; yea, many of them in theſe days are ran ſo far from God, that they do not beleeve that there is either God or Devil, Heaven or Hell, Church of Grace or Glory; Thus they are now fain to notorious Atheiſm, calling themſelves *Seekers* of the forementioned things, which for the preſent they have loſt.

FINIS.